



Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: With respect to claim 30, it appears that the argument in the middle paragraph of page 9 is directed to the fact that the extracted Fischer-Tropsch product is delivered directly to an alkylation step, which would differentiate it over O'Rear. While it appears that this is the intent by using the language "which is the product of a Fischer-Tropsch reaction" in part c) of claim 30, since the claim language is open, it is the position of the Office that part c) needs to be stated more clearly. The recommendation for claim 30 is something like: "directly feeding the raffinate stream containing olefins and paraffins from step b) to an alkylating stage with benzene in the presence of a suitable alkylation catalyst to produce linear alkyl benzene and linear paraffin."

With respect to claims 58-59, the remarks provided on December 22 are not persuasive. While there is an intermediate dehydrogenation step in O'Rear, there is no indication that the resulting olefinic product would have any more branching than the paraffinic feedstock. For example, Antos US 4420649, which is disclosed by O'Rear as being one of a plurality of suitable catalysts for the dehydrogenation reaction [see last paragraph of page 30], teaches the use of a catalyst that converts normal paraffins to normal mono-olefins with negligible isomerization [see column 4, lines 9-23]. Since the paraffinic feedstock and the alkylation reaction conditions seem to be similar as outlined in the prior Office action, it seems as though the product will be similar and meet the recited limitations. Evidence to the contrary needs to be provided to overcome this rejection. The same is true of claims 55-57, which were not addressed in the remarks..